UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/561,007	12/16/2005	005 Kai Paintner 2003P01085WOUS		6029	
	7590 03/19/200 PPLIANCES CORPOR	EXAMINER			
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 100 BOSCH BOULEVARD			RIGGLEMAN, JASON PAUL		
NEW BERN, N	= =		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1792		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/19/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Applica	tion No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)		
		10/561,	007	PAINTNER, KAI			
		Examin	er	Art Unit			
		JASON	P. RIGGLEMAN	1792			
The MA Period for Reply	ILING DATE of this commu	nication appears on t	he cover sheet with th	e correspondence ad	ddress		
A SHORTENE WHICHEVER I - Extensions of time after SIX (6) MON - If NO period for re - Failure to reply wit Any reply received	D STATUTORY PERIOD IN S LONGER, FROM THE IN may be available under the provision THS from the mailing date of this comply is specified above, the maximum shin the set or extended period for reploy the Office later than three months an adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE OF sof 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no munication. tatutory period will apply and y will, by statute, cause the a	FHIS COMMUNICATI event, however, may a reply be will expire SIX (6) MONTHS f pplication to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this coned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•		
Status							
2a)⊠ This action 3)□ Since thi	ive to communication(s) filon is <b>FINAL</b> .  s application is in condition accordance with the pract	2b)☐ This action is for allowance exce	non-final. ot for formal matters,		e merits is		
Disposition of Cla	iims						
4a) Of the 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8) ☐ Claim(s)  Application Paper	9-16 is/are pending in the above claim(s) is/a is/are allowed.  9-16 is/are rejected.  9-16 is/are rejected.  are subject to restricts  ification is objected to by the	are withdrawn from o					
10) The draw Applicant Replacem	incation is objected to by the ing(s) filed on 18 December may not request that any objected to a support of the including the content of the including the content of the including the content of the including th	er 2008 is/are: a) is/ection to the drawing(s g the correction is requ	) be held in abeyance. aired if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
2) D Notice of Draftsp	nces Cited (PTO-892) erson's Patent Drawing Review ( osure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Date		4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/561,007 Page 2

Art Unit: 1792

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Status of Claims

1. Applicant's reply filed on 12/18/2008 is acknowledged. Current pending claims are 9-16. Claims 9-16 are amended. Claims 1-8 are cancelled.

## Response to Arguments

- 2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are not persuasive. The applicant's amendments to the claims do not substantively change the grounds for rejection. The applicant argues that Hoyle is in contrast to the invention because the current invention includes a closed system wherein the same airstream is acted upon by the Peltier element and then reintroduced into the washing basket. This limitation was previously addressed in the motivation for recirculation the air below: It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hoyle to create a dishwashing machine which conserves energy (pg. 2 of Hoyle) to achieve the expected result. The rejection is maintained.
- 3. Note: the drawing objections and the previous 112, second paragraph, rejections are withdrawn in view of the amended claims. The double patenting rejection of claims 9-16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 7222439 are withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed 12/18/2008.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Application/Control Number: 10/561,007 Page 3

Art Unit: 1792

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 5. Claims 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoyle (UK Patent Application No. 2375812).
- 6. Hoyle teaches a work space having an outlet (2) connecting a Peltier element (first paragraph, pg. 2)(heat pump 10). The heat pump has a condenser (in duct 6), Fig. 1. The pipe has a heater (3) upstream of the condenser and communicating with the Peltier element. A fan (impeller 5) is operable to blow the air through the inlet (7). The air is cooled by the evaporator (in pipe 6) part of the Peltier element. Note: The <u>apparatus</u> claim 10 appears to contain method steps. These are not given patentable weight.
- 7. Hoyle does not teach that the workspace is a dishwasher, containing a washing basket, which recirculates (same airstream) the conditioned air; however, it has been held that an obvious choice in design is not patentable (*In re Kuhle* 188 USPQ 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hoyle to create a dishwashing machine which conserves energy (pg. 2 of Hoyle) to achieve the expected result.
- 8. Hoyle, as modified above, does not teach an additional condenser located in the recirculation loop; however, it has been held that duplication of parts would have been obvious (*In re Harza* 124 USPQ 378). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hoyle, as modified above, to create a dishwashing machine with sufficient condensing power to conserve energy to achieve the expected result.

#### Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Page 4

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON P. RIGGLEMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-5935. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/561,007 Page 5

Art Unit: 1792

/Michael Barr/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Jason P Riggleman
Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/J. P. R./ Examiner, Art Unit 1792